UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,877	10/16/2003	George Hage	HITRON.004A	7385

7590 01/27/2009

GAZDZINSKI & ASSOCIATES
Suite 375
11440 West Bernardo Court
San Diego, CA 92127

EXAMINER	
WONG, ALLEN C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,877	HAGE, GEORGE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allen Wong	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12,14-20,23,24 and 27-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12,14-20,23,24 and 27-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/14/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 20, 30, 33 and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/08 have been fully read and considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding lines 28-30 on page 8 and lines 4-5 on page 9 of applicant's remarks about claim 12, applicant states that Hart does not disclose the presence of the at least one camera being not readily expected or discernable by inhabitants of the location. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, lines 2-10, Hart discloses that the camera can be covered by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22, wherein the PIR 12 of fig.3 are passive infrared security sensors with multiple PIR circuits corresponding to multiple PIR sensors. Thus, Hart

discloses the at least one camera being not readily expected or discernable by inhabitants of the location, and meets the broad limitation of the claim as stated in claim 12.

Regarding lines 23-25 on page 10 of applicant's remarks about claim 1, applicant asserts that conversion from analog to digital signal is not permutation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Miriam Webster's Dictionary, 10th edition defines permutation as variation, change or transformation. A transformation of data from analog to digital is considered to be permutation of data because analog is one form of data and digital is another form of data. Thus, the prior art reasonably discloses permutation since the form of the data is changed, varied or transformed.

Regarding lines 1-4, lines 15-19 and lines 21-24 on page 11 applicant's remarks about claim 27, applicant asserts that Ramirez-Diaz does not disclose "computer program... without user intervention...sufficiently reduced resolution..." The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, lines 43-46, and figures 1-2, element 14, where figure 3 is the interior of element 14, Hart discloses element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12, in that element 52 processes the first and second data. Thus, Hart discloses at least one processing entity in data communication with the sensor and adapted to process the first data to produce second data, the second data intentionally altering the first data sufficiently.

Hart does not specifically disclose comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to intentionally altering, without user intervention, said first data sufficiently that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details

of individuals being monitored by said apparatus are not discernable. However, in column 7, lines 18-21, the operating system can automatically react without user intervention for resizing or reducing resolution. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz teaches comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to intentionally altering, without user intervention. In column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 6, Ramirez-Diaz's figure 2 discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the second data intentionally altering the first data sufficiently that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by the apparatus are not discernable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52.

Furthermore, with regards to claim 27, the applicant uses the phrase "may be displayed, without user intervention", which in fact makes the claim broader because the data maybe displayed without user intervention, or the data maybe displayed with user intervention. In other words, the claim can be reasonably interpreted to state the data may be displayed with user intervention or displayed without user invention.

Regarding line 29 on page 14 to line 3 on page 15, and lines 28-31 on page 15 of applicant's remarks about claims 23-24, applicant asserts that Arbuckle does not disclose "electrical interface...from the at least one first interface...", and that there is a difference between merely accommodating electrical wires, and an electrical interface adapted to internally transmit signals, and the second electrical interface comprising electronic circuitry adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least one first interface. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 5, lines 15-22, Arbuckle discloses the support element, also see column 5, lines 4-14 and column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 5. Thus, Arbuckle teaches a support element adapted to support and removably mate with the sensor element, the support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least one first interface. In column 5, lines 4-14 and column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 5, Arbuckle discloses wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Arbuckle, as a whole, for protecting the vital camera components, jacks and wires while permitting ease of use and installation of cameras for monitoring locations in surveillance tasks, as suggested in Arbuckle's column 2, lines 52-59.

Further, as defined in Miriam Webster's Dictionary 10th edition, the term "interface" is defined as a surface forming a common boundary of two bodies or means

by which interaction or communication is achieved. In other words, the electrical interface can be reasonably interpreted to disclose that since the first interface and the second interface is connected for interaction or communication, wherein electrical power and data is transmitted between the two interfaces as disclosed in Arbuckle. An electrical interface can be comprised of wires or metal contacts for permitting the transmission of electrical power and/or data.

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

New claims 38-39 are rejected below.

Thus, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hart (5,473,368).

Regarding claim 12, Hart discloses covert security sensor apparatus, comprising:

at least one camera adapted to generate video signals relating to at least one monitored location (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

wherein said camera is configured to look like a passive infrared security sensor such that the presence of said at least one camera is not readily expected or discernable by inhabitants of said location, thereby providing said covertness (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the camera can be covered by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22, wherein the PIR 12 of fig.3 are passive infrared security sensors with multiple PIR circuits corresponding to multiple PIR sensors).

Regarding claim 14, Hart discloses a passive IR (PIR) sensor (col.5, ln.49-51 and fig.3, element 12 are passive IR sensors, and the PIR circuit clock 42 have multiple PIR circuits, see col.6, ln.46-48).

Regarding claim 15, Hart discloses at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video signals to produce processed video data for viewing (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and at least one distribution entity adapted to distribute said processed data to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location).

Regarding claim 16, Hart discloses at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video signals to produce processed video data for viewing (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12), said processed video data comprising an altered representation of said signals (col.7, ln.16-21; fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14 for processing or altering the data).

Regarding claim 17, Hart discloses wherein said at least one processing entity comprises a digital processor with associated rnemory, and signal processing algorithm running thereon. (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Regarding claim 18, Hart discloses a data interface adapted to transfer at least portions of said processed video data to a remote monitoring location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location).

Regarding claim 19, Hart discloses a housing which appears as that associated with another type of sensor (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22); and providing a discrete aperture within said housing to accommodate said at least one camera (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22).

Regarding claim 20, Hart discloses a security sensor, comprising:

at least one camera adapted to generate video data relating to at least one monitored location (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video data to produce processed video data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and

at least one distribution entity adapted to distribute said processed data to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location), wherein said processed data allows viewing of only certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to

distribute or provide data to a remote location, and col.9, ln.7-17, the intruder's face is obtained for viewing, thus, only certain features of the monitored location is displayed for close examination).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 27-29 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368) in view of Ramirez-Diaz (6,476,858).

Regarding claim 1, Hart discloses a sensor assembly comprising:

at least one sensor adapted to generate first data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

at least one processing entity in data communication with said sensor and adapted to process said first data to produce second data, said second data having at least one desired effect associated therewith (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12);

wherein said processing comprises permutation of said first data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12 in that element 52 processes the data through permutation of data, in that permutation is

generally defined by the changing, variation or transformation of data, and changing from analog to digital is changing, varying or transforming the first data, thus, the first data is permuted).

Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said desired effect comprises the intentional reduction in the visual clarity of second data when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of said second data. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 2, Hart discloses wherein the sensor comprises an optical band semiconductor camera the use of IR band sensor (note fig.3 discloses the PIR circuit clock 42 for interacting with the PIR detector 12 of fig.1; see col.6, ln.64-col.7, ln.1).

Regarding claim 3, Hart discloses wherein the sensor comprises an IR band sensor (note fig.3 discloses the PIR circuit clock 42 for interacting with the PIR sensor or detector 12 of fig.1; see col.6, ln.64-col.7, ln.1).

Regarding claim 5, Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said at least one desired effect comprises selective deletion of portions of the field of view of said at least one sensor when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of same. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the adjustment of the desired effect of selective deletion of portions of the viewing of the second data (col.7, ln.42-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the selection and deletion of data and col.7, ln.51-57, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that certain areas or portions of the monitored scene can be selected for focus and examination to check for motion or intrusion activity). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 6, Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said at least one desired effect comprises selective permutation of the order of portions of the field of view of said at least one sensor when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of same. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the adjustment of the desired effect of selective permutations of portions of the viewing of the second data (col.7, ln.42-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the selection and deletion of data and col.7, ln.51-57, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that certain areas or portions of the monitored scene can be selected for focus and examination to check for motion or intrusion activity; col.7,

ln.60-col.8, ln.5, a motion detection algorithm is used to evaluate permutations of data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claims 7 and 9, Hart discloses further comprising a low-cost sensor housing within which at least a portion of said at least one sensor is disposed (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner), wherein said at least one sensor comprises a low cost B/W camera (fig.1-2, element 22), and said at least one preceding entity is disposed external of said housing, such that said sensor assembly is low cost as a whole and hence disposable in nature (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner).

Regarding claim 8, Hart discloses comprising a base element adapted for mounting the housing thereto, the base element containing the at least one processing entity (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22, where element 8 can be mounted to protect the camera from the harsh external conditions).

Regarding claim 10, Hart discloses the processing entity comprises a digital processor having an embedded memory and a plurality of computer code running thereon, the computer code being adapted to provide said processing of said first data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Regarding claim 11, Hart discloses the use of an ADC adapted to render the first data in the digital domain (col.7, ln.3 and fig.3, element 50).

Regarding claim 27, Hart discloses high privacy sensor apparatus, comprising:

at least one sensor adapted to generate first data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

at least one processing entity in data communication with said sensor and adapted to process said first data to produce second data, said second data intentionally altering said first data sufficiently (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Hart does not specifically disclose comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to process said first data such that video derived therefrom may be displayed, without user intervention, with sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by said apparatus are not discernable. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to

process the first data such that video derived therefrom may be displayed without user intervention (col.7, ln.18-21, the operating system can automatically react without user intervention for resizing or reducing resolution, thus data may be displayed without user invention), the second data altering the first data sufficiently such that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by the apparatus are not discernable (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 28, Hart discloses the face, ie. facial details, of the intruder captured on camera (col.9, ln.7-17).

Regarding claim 29, Hart does not disclose wherein said apparatus if further adapted to operate in a mode whereby said processing of said first data is altered so as to increase said resolution at least temporarily. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the adjustment of the desired effect of selective deletion of portions of the viewing of the second data for temporarily increasing resolution (col.7, ln.42-44, Ramirez-Diaz

discloses the selection and deletion of data and col.7, ln.51-57, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that certain areas or portions of the monitored scene can be selected for focus, ie. increasing resolution, and examination to check for motion or intrusion activity). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 38, Hart does not disclose wherein said processing comprises processing specifically configured to intentionally reduce said resolution or content. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the processing comprises intentionally reducing the resolution of video data content (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 37, Hart discloses transferring data from one location to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location). Hart does not disclose wherein said act of processing to produce second data having reduced visual clarity comprises processing to reducing the resolution of video generated from said second data sufficiently that the privacy of individuals disposed at said first location is protected before said second data is transmitted from said sensor assembly to another location. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches having reduced visual clarity comprises processing to reducing the resolution of video generated (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced) from the second data sufficiently that the privacy of individuals disposed at the first location is protected before the second data is transmitted from the sensor assembly to another location (col.3, ln.41-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that the obtained image data can be encrypted for securing the obtained data and maintaining the authenticity and preventing unauthorized access to important surveillance data and protecting the privacy of individuals from the monitored location before transmission to the remote location). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote

monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368) in view of Arbuckle (6,637,952).

Regarding claim 23, Hart discloses a quick-change, low-cost sensor assembly adapted to permit removal of a sensor and replacement with another identical or different sensor, comprising:

a sensor element having: (i) a low-cost molded sensor housing (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

(ii) at least one low-cost sensor disposed at least partly within said housing (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner); and (iii) at least one first electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one sensor (fig.1-2, element 80, and fig.3, element 76, col.7, ln.59-66).

Hart does not specifically disclose a support element adapted to support and removably mate with said sensor element, said support element comprising at least one second electrical interface comprising electronic circuitry adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one first interface; and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element

from said support element. Arbuckle teaches a support element adapted to support and removably mate with the sensor element, the support element comprising at least one second electrical interface comprising electronic circuitry adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least one first interface (col.5, ln.15-22, Arbuckle discloses the support element; col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5), and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element (col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Arbuckle, as a whole, for protecting the vital camera components, jacks and wires while permitting ease of use and installation of cameras for monitoring locations in surveillance tasks (Arbuckle col.2, ln.52-59).

Regarding claim 24, Hart discloses a quick-change, covert sensor assembly, comprising:

a sensor element having: (i) at least one optical sensor (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

(ii) at least one first electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one sensor (fig.1-2, element 80 and fig.3, element 76, col.7, ln.59-66); and

wherein said sensor assembly is adapted to appear as a non-visual sensor in order to deceive individuals for which optical monitoring is desired (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera

22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22).

Hart does not specifically disclose a support element adapted to support and removably mate with said sensor element, said support element comprising at least one second electrical interface comprising electronic circuitry adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one first interface, and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element. However, Arbuckle teaches the support element adapted to support and removably mate with the sensor element, the support element comprising at least one second electrical interface comprising electronic circuitry adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least one first interface (col.5, ln.15-22, Arbuckle discloses the support element; col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5), and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element (col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Arbuckle, as a whole, for protecting the vital camera components, jacks and wires while permitting ease of use and installation of cameras for monitoring locations in surveillance tasks (Arbuckle col.2, ln.52-59).

Claims 20, 33-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368) in view of Thomas (7,134,130).

Regarding claim 20, Hart discloses a security sensor, comprising:

at least one camera adapted to generate video data relating to at least one monitored location (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video data to produce processed video data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and

at least one distribution entity adapted to distribute said processed data to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location), wherein said processed data allows viewing of only certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location, and col.9, ln.7-17, the intruder's face is obtained for viewing, thus, only certain features of the monitored location is displayed for close examination).

Hart does not disclose wherein said processing of said video data by said processing entity is purposefully configured to preclude viewing of certain portions of the field of view of said at least one camera. However, Thomas teaches the processing of video data by the processing entity is purposefully configured to preclude viewing of certain portions of the field of view of the image obtained by the camera

(col.6, ln.7-11 and ln.24-28, Thomas discloses the prevention of display of content to unauthorized personnel or people without proper security clearance; col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Thomas, as a whole, for controlling access to the displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

Regarding claim 33, Hart discloses a remote security monitoring system, comprising:

sensors disposed at one or more locations to be monitored (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

at least one processing entity in operative communication with said sensors and adapted to process raw data from the sensors to produce processed data, said processed data having at least one desired attribute not present in said raw data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12);

at least one remote monitoring entity adapted to utilize the processed data (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location); and

a network interface adapted to transfer said processed data from said processing entity to said remote entity (col.7, ln.64-66, fig.3, element 76).

Although Hart does not specifically disclose the processing entity is located within the sensors, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the processing entity within the sensor for interactively connecting with the sensors for obtaining relevant detected data of the monitored scene so as to permit processing captured raw data and permit the accurate, clear display and presentation of the monitored scene. Doing so would provide good clear surveillance of the monitored scene for detecting intruders and suspicious activity.

Hart does not disclose at least one module adapted to, in response to a signal, cause said network interface to discontinue transfer of said processed data and begin transfer of said raw data to said remote entity. However, Thomas discloses the discontinued transfer of processed data and begin transfer of raw data to the remote entity (col.6, ln.7-11 and ln.24-28, Thomas discloses the prevention of display of content to unauthorized personnel or people without proper security clearance, but people with authorized access can have the raw data transmitted to the remote location for viewing; col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, but people with proper clearance can view the raw data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Thomas, as a whole, for controlling access to the displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

Regarding claim 34, Hart does not specifically disclose the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed. However, Thomas teaches the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed (col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, thus, the reduction of visual clarity is done when "blocked" or censored data is displayed). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Thomas, as a whole, for controlling access to the displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

Regarding claim 35, Hart discloses a signal interface (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12, where data signals are interfaced). Hart does not disclose wherein said system further comprises an operating mode wherein said processing of said raw data to produce said desired attribute is selectively not performed based on data transmitted over said signal interface. However, Thomas teaches the operating mode wherein the processing of raw data to produce the desired attribute is selectively not performed based on data transmitted (col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, thus, the reduction of visual clarity is done when "blocked" or censored data is displayed by the selective deletion of data to prevent the display of image data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Thomas, as a whole,

for controlling access to the displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

Regarding claim 36, Hart discloses a sensor assembly comprising:

at least one sensor adapted to generate first data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

at least one processing entity in data communication with said sensor and adapted to process said first data to produce second data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Hart does not specifically disclose said second data having intentionally reduced visual clarity when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of said second data; wherein said processing comprises selective deletion of certain portions of said first data. However, Thomas teaches the second data having intentionally reduced visual clarity when the second data is displayed by the apparatus adapted for viewing of the second data (col.6, ln.7-11 and ln.24-28, Thomas discloses the prevention of display of content to unauthorized personnel or people without proper security clearance; col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, thus, the visual clarity is reduced when displayed); wherein the processing comprises selective deletion of certain portions of the first data (col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, thus, the reduction of visual clarity is done when "blocked" or censored data is displayed by

the selective deletion of data to prevent the display of image data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Thomas, as a whole, for controlling access to the displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

Regarding claim 39, Hart discloses a security sensor, comprising:

at least one camera adapted to generate video data relating to at least one monitored location (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video data to produce processed video data for viewing at a remote location (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and

at least one distribution entity adapted to distribute said processed data to said remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location).

Hart does not disclose wherein said processing of said video data is configured to preclude viewing of certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants without affecting the viewing of other features of said monitored location. However, Thomas teaches the processing of video data is configured to preclude viewing of certain features of the monitored location or its inhabitants without affecting the viewing of other features of the monitored location (col.6, ln.7-11 and ln.24-28,

Thomas discloses the prevention of display of content to unauthorized personnel or people without proper security clearance; col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, thus, the video data portion that is blocked, thus, the surroundings of the video data displayed is not affected). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Thomas, as a whole, for controlling access to the displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

5. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368) and Ramirez-Diaz (6,476,858) in view of Thomas (7,134,130).

Regarding claim 30, Hart discloses a method of operating security monitoring apparatus disposed at a first location, the method comprising:

providing at least one sensor having signal processing apparatus (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

processing raw image data collected by said at least one sensor using said apparatus to produce second data, said second data having at least one attribute associated therewith (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and

monitoring said first location using said second data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22 monitors the first location).

Hart does not specifically disclose selectively, and responsive to a first indication, monitoring said first location using said raw image data. However, Ramirez-Diaz discloses selectively, and responsive to a first indication, monitoring said first location using the first raw image data (col.4, ln.20-29, fig.7, note use of remote console 5a to 5n for viewing, via the LAN or any network means 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Hart and Ramirez-Diaz do not disclose censored image data, said censored image data comprising footage wherein anonymity of legitimate inhabitants of said location is protected under all operational circumstances. However, Thomas teaches the censored image data comprising footage wherein anonymity of legitimate inhabitants of the location is protected under all operational circumstances (col.6, ln.7-11 and ln.24-28, Thomas discloses the prevention of display of content to unauthorized personnel or people without proper security clearance; col.8, ln.20-28, Thomas discloses the concept of blocking in that includes blocking certain portions of the video data from viewing, in that anonymity of the people displayed on the screen can be maintained by blocking out portions of the video data; col.7, ln.43-48, Thomas discloses the control device for continually checking and verifying data to determine whether the video data should be displayed under operational circumstances). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart, Ramirez-Diaz and Thomas, as a whole, for controlling access to the

displayed video information and conveniently, selectively blocking the display of video information (Thomas col.1, ln.44-47 and ln.60-63).

Regarding claim 31, Hart discloses the act of monitoring is conducted at a second location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location). Hart does not disclose said first indication comprises an alarm signal generated at least in part at said first location. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the alarm signal can be generated (col.4, ln.28-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 32, Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said act of processing to produce second data having at least one attribute comprises processing to reducing the resolution of video generated from said second data sufficiently that the privacy of individuals disposed at said first location is maintained. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction of resolution of video data (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a

whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7341. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Allen Wong

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

/Allen Wong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621
1/27/09